

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the consideration of the present application afforded by the Examiner. Claims 1-16 and 18 were pending prior to the Office Action. Claims 3, 5, 8, and 10-12 are canceled and claim 25 has been added through this Reply. Therefore, claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 13-16, 18 and 25 are pending. Claims 1, 13, 18, and 25 are independent. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 6-8, and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,657,654 to Narayanaswami ("Narayanaswami") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0095501 A1 to Chiloyan et al. ("Chiloyan"). Claims 3-5, 9, 10, 15, 16, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Narayanaswami in view of Chiloyan and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,715,003 to Safai ("Safai").

Claims 3, 5, 8, and 10-12 have been canceled by Amendment, rendering the rejection of these claims moot. As applied to the remaining claims, Applicants submit the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and traverse the rejection.

Regarding claims 1 and 18:

Amended claim 1 recites that the videoconference system comprises, *inter alia*:
a computer having a program for videoconference and a program for image display, both of which are automatically booted when it is detected that the electronic camera is connected duplex-communicably to the computer,

wherein the program for image display makes the computer execute a function of making a display device of the computer simultaneously display a list of images recorded in a recording medium in the electronic camera or recorded in a recording medium in the computer; and

wherein the program for videoconference makes the computer execute, when an image is selected from the list of images during communication and image transmission is commanded, a function of making the selected image transmitted to a communication partner.

Regarding independent claim 1, the Examiner cites Narayanaswami as allegedly disclosing a videoconference system that enables a computer to connect with an electronic camera 116 that captures video to be used during the videoconference (see Fig. 2, col. 2, line 66 - col. 3, line 8). In the Office Action, the Examiner concedes that Narayanaswami does not teach automatically booting the videoconference program upon detection that the camera is connected duplex-communicably to the computer. To cure this deficiency, the Examiner relies upon the Chiloyan reference, which appears to disclose a system which automatically executes an appropriate program when it is detected that a peripheral device such as a digital camera has been connected to a computer (see paragraph [0037]).

The Examiner further concedes that the combination of Narayanaswami and Chiloyan does not teach a program for image display including displaying a list of images and transferring

selected images to a server. The Examiner relies upon the Safai reference to teach this feature. Safai appears to teach a photo selection view of small-size representations (thumbnails) of images (col. 11, lines 45-61) and transmission of images to a server.

However, Safai does not disclose or suggest a videoconferencing application or that the photo selection view and image transmission allegedly disclosed by Safai can be performed during a videoconference. Also, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Narayanaswami that the inclusion of a image transmission functionality into the videoconferencing application of Narayanaswami would be desirable. In fact, there is no suggestion or motivation found in any of the prior art references for including an image selection and transmission functionality during a videoconferencing application. Absent some motivation for combining the image transmission system of Safai with the videoconferencing system of Narayanaswami, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to provide a *prima facie* case for obviousness.

The features of amended claim 1 make it possible that the videoconference communication partner and the recipient of the transmitted images can be the same. Narayanaswami, Chiloyan, and Safai do not disclose or suggest a system where this is possible. Furthermore, the prior art does not disclose or suggest an image display program and a videoconference program both of which are automatically booted when it is detected that the electronic camera is connected duplex-communicably to the computer.

At least because there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Narayanaswami, Chiloyan, and Safai in the manner contended by the Examiner, and because the references do not disclose all the features of the claims, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentably

distinguishable from the prior art and is therefore allowable. Claims 2, 4, 6, 7, and 9 depend from claim 1, directly or indirectly. Therefore, claims 2, 4, 6, 7, and 9 are allowable.

The reasoning applied above with respect to claim 1 is hereby also applied to claim 18. Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claim 18 is patentably distinguishable from the prior art and is therefore allowable. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 11:

Claim 11 recites the feature, inter alia, wherein "the computer makes the program for videoconference operate only when it is detected that the electronic camera is connected duplex-communicably and is a predetermined model." Applicants submit that Narayanaswami, as modified by Chiloyan, does not disclose this feature.

As previously discussed, the Examiner concedes that Narayanaswami does not teach automatically booting the videoconference program upon detection that the camera is connected duplex-communicably to the computer. The Examiner has relied upon the Chiloyan reference to teach a system which automatically executes an appropriate program when it is detected that a peripheral device such as a digital camera has been connected to a computer. However, Chiloyan does not disclose or suggest executing a program when it is detected that a peripheral device is connected duplex-communicably and is a predetermined model.

Chiloyan appears to disclose that the host device (computer) queries the peripheral device for a device descriptor, which can include information such as a vendor ID and a product ID (see paragraph [0013]). However, this device descriptor is not described as relating to a

predetermined model. In the present invention, when a camera is connected duplex-communicably to a computer, a determination is made whether the camera has a videoconferencing capability based upon the model of the camera. If the camera model is one with a videoconferencing capability, the computer loads the videoconferencing program. In Chiloyan, however, a device descriptor of a peripheral device is used to determine whether peripheral information is listed in the computer operating system's device registry and whether the appropriate device driver is available (see paragraph [0044]). Chiloyan does not disclose or suggest making a determination about whether to load a particular program or not based upon a determination of a model of the peripheral.

In this instance, the combination of Narayanaswami and Chiloyan fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 11. As demonstrated above, Narayanaswami fails to teach or suggest wherein "the computer makes the program for videoconference operate only when it is detected that the electronic camera is connected duplex-communicably and is a predetermined model" as recited in claim 11. Chiloyan has not been, and indeed cannot be, relied upon to correct at least this deficiency of Narayanaswami. Claim 12 depends from claim 11. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated with respect to claim 11, claim 12 is also distinguishable from the cited prior art. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 11 and 12 are patentable over Narayanaswami in view of Chiloyan and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 11 and 12 under §103(a) be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 13:

Original claim 13 recites, *inter alia*, the feature wherein "the videoconference program makes the computer perform a function of using personal information of the user at the time of user registration by another program."

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswami in view of Chiloyan in the same manner as independent claim 1. The Examiner has failed to address the aforementioned feature of claim 13, which is not present in claim 1.

Applicants submit that Narayanaswami in view of Chiloyan does not teach or suggest this feature of claim 13. Claim 13 is therefore distinguishable from the applied prior art. Claims 14-16 are dependent upon claim 13. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated with respect to claim 13, claims 14-16 are also distinguishable from the cited prior art.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 13-16 are patentable over Narayanaswami in view of Chiloyan and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 13-16 under §103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Notice of same is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone

Application No. 10/066,373
Amendment dated March 12, 2007
Reply to Office Action of December 12, 2006

Docket No.: 0879-0374P

number below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: March 12, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Dr. Richard Anderson

Registration No.: 40,439

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant